

Summary/Comments Volume I

- Page 1, second column, second full paragraph. The interrelationship between Volume 1 and Volume 2 could be expanded upon. For example, how and where will targets and actions from Volume II be applied within Ecological Zones.
- Table of Contents for Volume I does not break out subheadings like Volume II; also, subheadings within Ecological Zones are not consistent.
- Page 23, DELTA Ecological Zone Restoration Plan and
- Page 25, Restoration Plan Components. Are the Elements 1,2,3,4,5,6 (p. 25-31) related to the seven main elements referred to on page 23. If so, maybe a statement saying how related.
- Page 35, A brief introduction on p. 35 is needed comparable to that on page 56 for Habitats. For example, what ecosystem components are addressed; stressors, habitats, others? What about other elements, i.e. physical processes - secondary.
- Page 31, Appendix 14 - missing.
- Page 32, Table 2. This kind of a summary table would be very helpful for each of the ecological zones, maybe summarize all target information from p. 35 - 79 on this table, as well as for other ecological zones.

Example Summary Table

Ecosystem Element and Target Summaries	Ecological Zones				
	A	B	C	D	etc.
Habitat Restoration					
a. Shaded riverine (could show ^{codes} that would indicate species that would be benefited)					
b. Seasonal Wetland					
c. Tidal emergent wetland					
etc.					
Channel/Floodplain improvements					
Hydraulics					
Reduce losses at unscreened diversion					
Contaminants reduction					
Etc.					

This table could be combined with targets/actions from Volume II to show overlap between Volume I and II and also to provide a summary for the programmatic EIR/EIS.

At this Draft Stage, Volume I and II contain wealth of good information but it is difficult to track between ecological zone units species, habitats, and all of the ecosystem elements that are addressed. A series of summary tables would be very useful to convey this information to the lay public and for stakeholders. Summary tables could ultimately serve to show priorities for implementation across ecological zones. In addition, as specific targets and action are approved they could be added to the tables.

Summary tables could also be used to evaluate for overlap between targets in Volume I and II. For example, habitat restoration that would benefit species could be cross referenced (see example). The summary tables could be incorporated into an Executive Summary after review comments on this first Draft of the ERPP. An executive summary is probably going to be requested by most reviewers.

- p. 116 and 138, inconsistency between Riparian Scrub Shrub vs. Riparian/Shaded Riverine Aquatic
- p. 139, Midchannel Islands and Shoals missing
- p. 166, Reference to Table 1 on bottom of page refers to a summary table that doesn't appear to exist.
- p. 167, Table 1 first paragraph appears to be a correct reference but contradicts page 166 reference.
- p. 168, Needs introduction that summarizes Resource Elements to be addressed similar to page 115 and 116.
- p. 196, Sediment supply; Gravel Cleansing and Transport; Levees, bridges, and bank protection appear to be missing.
- p. 207, "Establish a continuous 130 mile riparian habitat zone" (130 miles?)
- ~~p. 322, Gravel Transport Cleansing heading is missing.~~

Summary/Comments Volume 1 continued

- p.225-226 Land Use- The targets and actions appear to be so general that they lack a realistic approach. Actions need to be more specific e.g. if a buffer zone is to be created, how will land be obtained. By purchase, easement, other? This comment applies to all land use sections.
- p.253 Section missing on Vegetation Succession/Overbank Flooding
- p.256 Chinook salmon holding ponds section missing- also no reference to Species and Species Group resource elements
- p.298 Water Temperature missing- also Secondary Ecosystem Functions missing
- p.303 Land Use and Human Made Structures Headings missing
- p.322 Gravel Transport and Cleansing missing
- p.327 All Habitat headings after Shaded Riverine are missing
- p.344 Headings do not agree with p.346-355, e.g., fish passage vs. Dams, Reservoirs, Structures. Heading for Contaminants not on p.344. Riparian scrub missing p.354.
- p.369 Streamflow target does not provide a range of values like most other ecological zones
- p.370 Targets and Actions for Stream Meander are not stated in a way they can be measured for success.
- p.371 Land Use Targets and Actions are not stated in a way they can be measured for success.
- p.372 Contaminants target and actions too general to be assessed

Summary/Comments Volume II

- Targets and Actions not broken out for all ecosystem elements - need to explain in Introduction when this will occur or if some topics will not have targets/actions. e.g. no targets/actions for: nontidal perennial aquatic habitat, saline emergent wetlands, fresh emergent wetland, inland dune scrub, Agricultural lands, delta smelt, split tail, longfin smelt, white and green sturgeon.
- Pathway to Vision subheadings seem to be used when Targets/Actions are not identified. Probably need to have some explanation that these are programmatic at this stage, i.e. targets are yet to be identified.
- Short-term and long-term is sometimes used for Targets and Actions: probably need ^{or quantitative} at least a qualitative description of what short and long-term mean.
- There are some cases where the heading Target and Actions contain only actions or only targets, e.g. p. 69, actions are stated for tidal perennial habitat but not targets. p. 79, actions are stated for Delta Sloughs but not targets.
- The letter designations for Ecological Health are a useful method for assessing existing health of ecosystem elements. Two suggestions:
 1. Add to the introduction a brief qualitative explanation of how these ratings were formed, e.g. compared to what (what is an A rating).
 2. Make the ratings as specific as possible for ecological zones, e.g.

p. 73 OK

P. 81 OK

P. 87 OK

P. 99 OK

L-2 P. 105 missing

L-3 p. 117 can this be more specific like page 125

p. 125 OK

Most fish species have one overall rating. An exception is the steelhead trout (p. 165). Will it be possible to apply this specificity to other fish species.

- L-4 • page 102 and 108, Habitat Restoration Heading - Is this really Targets and Actions
- L-5 • page 122, Target not clearly stated
- L-6 • page 131, No target is stated qualitative or quantitative. Agricultural interests will want some statement.

Volume II continued

- L-7 p. 185 - first paragraph states the CALFED vision is restoration to levels of the 1960s and 1970s but also states the long term restoration target is restoration to levels that existed from 1980-1984. This may say the same thing but appears to be inconsistent
- L-8 p. 188- the actions on this page are good examples of those that should be cross referenced to flow and habitat restoration targets already proposed in Volume 1. Inclusion in a summary table would accomplish this.
- L-9 p. 201- the targets stated here are too restrictive when applied over regional areas as implied here. It seems more appropriate to try and restore in some core areas like those proposed on p. 197
- L-10 p. 205- targets for riparian forest and oak woodland need to be stated for specific ecological zones. The target of increasing prey populations may not be practical enough to include. If an action was stated it would be possible to evaluate this target. Other targets on p. 205 are lacking targets.
- L-11 p. 208 and 209- under Targets and Actions - all of these appear to be actions- probably need to state some targets so that the actions can be judged against the targets.
- L-12 p.213 Target and actions not differentiated
- L-13 • p.219 Targets and actions mixed again- no clear target statement e.g., crane numbers recruitment numbers, nesting success etc.
- L-14 • ²²³ P.233 First paragraph second column - targets for this species are not stated but referenced back to "related ecological zones". Cross reference to acreage's is OK but acreage's or abundance/distribution should be stated so that targets for species can be measured to assess to see if they are achieved
- L-15. ²³ p.227 Same comment as p.233, no clearly stated target to measure success of actions actions don't seem to be prioritized to major stressors- third and fifth bullets seem to be actions that should be stated as priority actions
- L-16 • p.232 Target of 2-3 thousand acres (short term) and 3 thousand acres (long term) of tidal saline emergent wetlands should be cross referenced to p.102. It should be explained that this is either in addition to or more likely it is the same as stated on p.102. Summary Table would accomplish this - see comments above
- First two bullets under targets and actions appear to be targets- should be stated as targets
- L-17 • p.240-241 Targets are not stated. If the vision is to increase key habitats then one or more targets for habitat would be appropriate, If targets from specific ecological zones are to be used (p.241) the specific acreages and zones should be identified.

- L-18 • p.246 Relate target of 2k-5k of perennial grassland to p.127 (2k-6k) - same target? Relate target of 5k-6k of agricultural land to p.131 where there is no stated target. Relate riparian scrub and forest targets to p.93 and 94.
- L-19 • p.251 Pathway to vision targets are indirectly referred to as ecosystem restoration in the Suisun Marsh and the Sacramento-San Joaquin Zones. This is probably not specific enough to measure the effectiveness of actions for increasing waterfowl abundance, nesting success etc. Targets specific to waterfowl (e.g. abundance) need to be stated.
- L-20 • p.255 Targets should be cross referenced to habitats and ecological zones in a summary table
- L-21 • p.262 Overall an excellent section, well written. Timing and magnitude of flows would seem to be an important target to identify. No inflows/outflows or other hydraulic parameters are identified as targets. Although individual parameters may not be appropriate (p.24) some qualitative target statement needs to be included as on page 117 of Volume I.
- L-22 • p.268 Targets and Actions mixed. Overall comment Stressors- Several categories are missing including Land Use, Water Management, and Gravel Mining.
- L-23 • p.275 Short and Long term targets are stated in the introduction. These targets should be moved to precede actions on page 277 under Pathway to Vision. Needs a heading for Targets and Actions.
- L-24 • p.283 No targets- refer back to Volume I e.g. p.35
- L-25 • p.287-347 Same comment - need to provide specific linkage back to targets for ecological zones
- Overall Comment Volume II- The format is different from Volume I in that Implementation Objectives, Targets, and Actions are not stated or not stated consistently. Probably need to explain in Introduction if this is by design.